

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 240

CS 209 029

AUTHOR Hantz, Alan W.; Wright, Donald K.
TITLE Social Responsibility Personality Differences between Male and Female Communicators.
PUB DATE 5 Aug 85
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (68th, Memphis, TN, August 3-6, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Behavioral Science Research; Comparative Analysis; Ethics; Females; Higher Education; Males; Moral Values; *Public Relations; *Sex Differences; *Social Responsibility; *Student Attitudes; *Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to explore in what ways, if any, male public relations practitioners differ from their female counterparts in their level of social responsibility. Subjects were 105 public relations practitioners (60% female and 40% male) and 215 college students (71% female and 29% male), who completed the Berkowitz-Luttermann SRS Scale. The scale measures the respondents' orientation toward helping others even when there is nothing to be gained from such acts. Scale items were presented in Likert-scale format with agree/disagree response options. The results indicated that the students possessed a more fragmented attitude about social responsibility than did the professionals. Several differences appeared between men and women students where no such differences appeared among professionals. Women students tended to endorse more strongly the traditional values of doing one's best, keeping promises to friends, the need to associate oneself with others, and the worth of volunteering. The male students seemed to have acquired these aspects of personality, but to a much lesser degree. One possible explanation for the relative uniformity of attitude among male and female professionals may be that the field serves to shape the attitude toward greater responsibility. In this case, one would expect the students to increase in social responsibility over time. However, if one views these attitudes as deeply ingrained, then the results portend a decline in the future responsibility of professionals.
(HTH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED258240

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official ERIE
position or policy.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PERSONALITY DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE COMMUNICATORS

Alan M. Hantz
Associate Professor
Dept. of Language & Literature
Univ. of North Carolina--Asheville
Asheville, N.C. 28314
(704) 258-6411

Donald K. Wright
Chairman
Department of Communication
University of South Alabama
Mobile, Alabama 36688
(205) 460-6301

A paper
presented to the
Research Paper Session
of the
Committee on the Status of Women
Association for Education in Journalism
and Mass Communication
Memphis, Tennessee
August 5, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donald K. Wright

A. Hantz

05209029

While women have gained substantial professional progress in various aspects of journalism and mass communication during the past two decades these gains have been greatest in public relations. Recent studies have praised public relations for offering substantial opportunities to American women and few occupations can claim as high a percentage of women at the management levels as public relations currently does.¹

Two of the last three national presidents of the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) have been women. The PRSA membership was 27 percent female in 1980 but in 1985 women constitute 43 percent of the 12,300 PRSA members.² The International Association of Business Communicators (IABC), the other major American-based professional society for public relations practitioners, reports that 59.8 percent of its 12,100 members in 1985 are female.³ There are just under 9,000 IABC members in the United States and 60.3 percent of these are women. Females also outnumber males in American journalism schools and Peterson reports that 70 percent of journalism school graduates who have accepted communications employment in recent years have worked in public relations.⁴

Despite these large numbers there has been very little mass communication research measuring differences between men and women who work in public relations. Broom and Smith found significant differences between men and women public relations practitioners in a comprehensive study of individual perceptions of occupational role models.⁵ Other studies report that men are paid more money than women for comparable services but find

few other differences.⁶ Bates found that a number of men who hold senior management positions in public relations are concerned the growing percentage of women in the field will cause public relations to be both typecast as "women's work," and to lose some of the "clout" the field now has as a management function.⁷

Purpose of the Study

The study discussed in this essay explores what ways, if any, men who work in public relations differ from women in that field on their level of social responsibility. It employs a previously tested scale for measuring social responsibility to populations of public relations practitioners and students.

The importance of social responsibility as a function of public relations has increased in recent years. As consumer activists gained more credibility, many corporations made public relations departments responsible for social accountability. Despite this obvious importance of social responsibility in public relations there have been few published studies evaluating or measuring this concept and its impact.⁸

How to Measure Responsibility

The quantitative measurement of social responsibility has presented procedural problems to social scientists for many years.⁹ One technique, often suggested but never perfected, examines social responsibility in a situational context. Another more theoretically demonstrable routine suggests that social responsibility might be measured effectively by relating methodological procedures of the theory of social responsibility to a composite of individual attitude elements reflecting behavior and

classified as accountable, reliable and so forth.¹⁰ Considerable theoretical documentation exists to suggest that readiness to behave in a socially responsible manner is related to particular attitudes.¹¹ For example, Gough, McClosky and Meehl studied human personality characteristics and discovered correlations suggesting certain people possess more values relevant to social responsibility than do others.¹² Other studies of personality support this theory.¹³

Scale Development

Difficulties confronted in the development of scales measuring social responsibility are well documented. The major problems encountered have involved such psychological variables as dominance, sense of responsibility, self-confidence, suggestibility and the constellation of factors determining political participation.¹⁴

Detail Specifics

Within the context of socially responsible behavior, public relations communicators today "should act at all times with the best interests of society in mind."¹⁵ Or as Harlow puts it, today's public relations person "defines and emphasizes the responsibility of management to serve the public interest," and does so by working to adjust organizational behavior to meet the social, political and economic responsibilities and the needs of society.¹⁶

Working Definition

The working definition of social responsibility in communications will be a willingness to accept the consequences of one's behavior; dependability;

trustworthiness; a sense of obligation to society.

There are people upon whom we can always count and depend. When they promise that they will do something, we can always count on their doing it. We can count on their work and trust them. There are people who are "square shooters" and ones who don't try to take advantage of, or cheat, others. When mistakes are made, they will own up to them rather than trying to blame others. These people aim for the good of society rather than always for their own gain. They are loyal to others. These are people who get things done. On a committee, or an assignment, they get right to work and can be counted upon to do good work promptly. Others would describe these people in such terms as "you can depend on them," "They always do their part," etc. These responsible people will not necessarily be leaders in their groups, or of higher than average intelligence, but will be primarily the people who do seem to have senses of commitment to the group and to society as a whole. They are dependable and possess integrity.

Responsible Practitioners Needed

Apparently there is considerable need for this type of value structure in public relations today. Surveys now tell us that 70 percent of the American public believes business has an obligation to society before it has an obligation to make a profit.¹⁷ In addition, most Americans don't think business has a social conscience and 65 percent believe businesses will do everything necessary to make profits even if it means ignoring the needs of society.¹⁸

It is valuable here to review the two schools of thought which pertain to social responsibility in a communications framework.¹⁹ Friedman's view says businesses are responsible only to themselves and should concentrate on making profits.²⁰ This theory presupposes that said profits would be

taxed and that governments would care for society's needs.²¹ The contrasting view insists that social responsibility should prevail to some extent over net profitability.²²

Indeed, part of the concern over social responsibility in public relations comes with the continued evaluation of the public relations function to upper-level management status. At the beginning of this century, most public relations people were fly-by-night press agents dealing mainly in publicity junkets. Today there are many public relations people who hold corporate titles such as "senior vice-president," report directly to top-level management and they deal with selling corporate images to stockholders and other publics. With the elevation and increased importance of the function has come a more developed body of knowledge, professional societies, codes of ethics, systems for accreditation of practitioners by examination, processes for reporting violations including reviewing and censuring, a foundation furthering public relations research and education, specified curricula for study at the university-level, a system of accreditation for programs teaching public relations in the U.S., and action designed to standardize public relations education on a global basis.

This new role of the public relations person has been addressed by leading practitioners, including David Finn, Chairman of Ruder, Finn & Rotman and Frank Wylie, a Past President of the Public Relations Society of America and the former public relations director of the Chrysler Corporation. Finn states that the current function of the public relations person is less that of a communicator and more of a moderator, assisting clients in conducting business in response to the new demands made by society.²³ Wylie frequently has reminded practitioners that they have a

societal obligation and that this all begins with the individual practitioner.²⁴

Behavioral Influences and Personality

The concept of personality is a theoretical construct used to guide acts that must be made in the face of uncertainty.²⁵ We must address quickly the one major limitation of personality research. This is that certain social scientists believe its use might be an obstacle to posing the most fruitful research questions dealing with actual behavior.²⁶ On the other hand, since leading behaviorists including Skinner and Watson, argue that behavior is learned and based upon the individual's values, etc., one of this essay's arguments is that as public relations researchers we must first learn about the particular personality factors associated with social responsibility before we progress to the stage of being able to examine personality in line with antecedent, current, and consequent conditions, and decision making.²⁷ Indeed, as the emerging field of environmental psychology continues to exert a major impact upon the study of the behavioral influence, public relations research stands to gain much in understanding the complexity of the relationship between how a person feels about oneself and one's social role and how that person acts.

Previous SR Studies

A good starting point for this personality portrait of public relations practitioners, and the measure of sex differences in these personalities, exists in the research materials mentioned above. Berkowitz and Daniels found that highly responsible people often are not governed by social exchange principles. "Rather than giving benefits to others only to the degree that fairly immediate rewards from others have been received or are

anticipated, this kind of person will tend to help people even when there is nothing to be gained from others."²⁸ Some individuals, it seems, possess extremely strong internal standards of right and wrong and their attitudes, as well as behaviors, reflect a concern for others more than for themselves.

To develop this methodology further, Berkowitz worked with Lutterman to explore the personalities of those thought, traditionally, to be socially responsible.²⁹ They checked their scale with associations between personality factors and other survey responses and discovered that readiness to behave in a socially responsible manner could be related to certain attitudes. Those who scored high on what has come to be known as the Berkowitz-Lutterman SRS Scale possessed many of the traditional values of the American core culture. These people believe in finishing tasks they have started, meet their obligations and do as well as possible all jobs assigned to them. They stick to the duties given them even in the face of temptations. They strongly oppose letting their friends down, and strongly favor working for the good of the team rather than for their own good; they insist that people should vote, participate in community activities, avoid cheating on their income taxes, and so forth. Six of the eight items in this SRS scale are drawn from a social responsibility scale for children derived by Harris,³⁰ and these, in turn, are similar to items constructed earlier by Gough, McClosky and Meehl.³¹

Equally important are the contributions of scholars examining personalities which deviate from society. Generally these scholars have observed a negative relationship between various social responsibility scales and alienation measures. These findings were confirmed by McClosky and Schaar.³² The results suggest that the socially responsible personality is typically

unalienated from society.³³ Alienated persons are typically those cut off from the mainstream of society and see themselves apart from others.³⁴ Consequently, the opposite of alienation must involve a sense of participation and involvement in society.³⁵

Those who have measured social responsibility in terms of personality are quick to point out that the attitudes expressed by subjects in this research have been affected by the environment and culture in which the subjects exist.³⁶ If the traditional socially responsible person is highly involved in society, one should expect many of this person's specific beliefs and actions to be influenced considerably by society.

Research Question:

The principle research question posed in this study was:

In what ways, if any, do males in the public relation field differ from females in that field on their level of social responsibility?

METHOD

In answering this research question, it was necessary to operationally define "social responsibility" in some way that would prove both conceptually and analytically sound. Fortunately, a scale for the measurement of social responsibility exists. In this research, respondents were administered the Berkowitz-Luttermann SRS Scale.³⁷ This instrument holds a history of nearly two decades of reliability and validity in the measurement of general social responsibility. The scale assesses the respondent's traditional social responsibility, the orientation toward helping others even when there is

nothing to be gained from them. It is a measure of social responsibility as an aspect of personality. Items in the Berkowitz-Luttermann scale focus on traditional values and are thus likely to adhere to an essentially conservative-individualist theme. The total concept assessed by the scale is conceived by Berkowitz and Luttermann as the polar opposite of alienation.

Scale items were presented in straightforward Likert-scale format, with five response options ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Four of the eight items were worded in the responsible direction, while four were worded in the opposite direction. Figure One depicts the items and the abbreviations used for the items in the results tables that follows.

FIGURE 1: SRS Scale Items

Responsible Direction Questions	Abbreviation
Every person should give some time for the good of his or her country.	Time for Country
It is the duty of each person to do his or her job the very best he or she can.	Do one's best
I usually volunteer for special projects.	Volunteer
I feel very bad when I have failed to finish a job I promised I would do.	Keep promises
Opposite Direction Questions	Abbreviation
It is no use worrying about current events or public affairs; I can't do anything about them anyway.	Current Events
Our country would be a lot better off if we didn't have so many elections and people didn't have to vote so often.	Elections
Letting your friends down is not so bad because you can't do good all the time for everybody.	Letting friends down
People would be a lot better off if they could live far away from other people and never have anything to do with them.	Distance from others

Two sample groups provided the data for this study. The population for public relations practitioners consisted of members of an International Association of Business Communicators (IABC) chapter in a major southeastern city. Mail questionnaires were sent to 187 potential respondents and 105 usable responses were received, for a better than average, 56% return rate. The SRS scale was also administered to a random sample of 215 students enrolled in public relations courses at a nearby, major state university's journalism school. These courses were within an AEJMC accredited sequence in public relations. In addition to the SRS scale, respondents in both groups provided demographic data for use in sub-group comparisons. IABC members were used because there are greater numbers of women in that organization. The student sample can be justified for several reasons. Since these students were journalism majors in public relations sequence courses at a major university there is a good chance they soon will be working in public relations. According to AEJMC profiles of journalism school students and graduates a majority of the students today are female and a large percentage of graduates eventually work in public relations.³⁸ Most of the students (56%) were juniors, while 29% were seniors. The remaining 15% were spread among freshmen, sophomores and graduate levels.

The average age among the students was 20.9 years. Seventy-one percent of the students were female while 29% were male. Practitioners ranged in age from 20 to 66, with 35.5 as the average age. There were more women (60%) in the practitioner sample than men (40%). The age and sex demographics of the sample are almost identical to the IABC membership averages described earlier. This group was well educated, as 91% reported having university degrees including 18% with graduate degrees. In terms of specific education

in "journalism or communication," 72% reported possessing such a degree while only 8% reported having no formal education at all in some aspect of the communication field.

Data Analysis

The data obtained from the above procedure were combined and tested for differences between mean responses of men versus those of women in the study was made using the t-test procedure. Two different comparisons were made. First an overall comparison was done using the sum of responses to all eight items, adjusted to reflect higher numbers in the responsible direction. Next, the groups were compared on an item by item basis across all eight scale items.

The secondary analyses comparing male to female professionals, male to female students, and that of professionals with students used these same procedures. Because this study represents an exploratory effort, it was determined that the level of significance observed would be .10. As it turned out, however, most of the differences observed were significant at the p .05 level.

RESULTS

1. Overall Sex Differences in Social Responsibility.

The results of this study can only be examined in relation to the relative meaning of the scores obtained. On the overall measure of social responsibility, a score of 8 to 23 indicates a lack of social responsibility, decreasing with the score. A score of 25 to 40 represents greater social responsibility in general, with 40 representing a maximum. A score of 24 represents the middle of the responsible-irresponsible range. On the

individual Likert items, a mean of 1 to 2.9 indicates a lack of responsibility, and a score of 3.1 to 5 indicates increasing responsibility. A score of 3.0 represents the midpoint of this continuum.

The results of the overall analysis are depicted in Table One. A significant difference was observed between men and women on overall social responsibility. Although the responses of both men and women averaged in the responsible direction, the mean overall score for women was significantly higher (35.18) than that for men (34.07).

Examination of the mean scores for men versus women on an item-by-item basis reveals significant differences on five of the eight aspects of social responsibility measured. It should be noted that the means for both men and women were all in the responsible direction, and that on seven of the eight items, means exceeded 4, indicating a moderate to high level of responsibility. For the volunteerism item, scores were between 3 and 4 for both groups, still indicating a responsible attitude, but one relatively low in strength compared to other items.

No significant differences were observed on the current events, time to country, elections, and the letting friends down items. Men scored higher than women, but not significantly so, only on the current events and elections items.

On the item dealing with keeping one's promises women agreed in significantly greater strength than did men (women's mean=4.65; men=4.53). Small but significant differences were also observed on the item about doing the best one can, with women exhibiting a stronger agreement than men (4.69 vs. 4.52). Larger differences were observed on the item concerning dealings with others. Again, women endorsed the responsible position in significantly greater strength than did men in the study (4.75 vs. 4.50).

The item advocating volunteerism was the one on which both groups scored lowest, and also the one on which the greatest significant difference was observed. The mean for women on this item was 3.78, indicating a moderately responsible attitude. The mean score for men on this item was 3.33, indicating a somewhat less responsible outlook. It should be recalled at this point that a mean of 3 on these items reflects neutrality, with a possible high of 5. Thus the score of both groups, but especially men, should be regarded as rather low.

In an effort to explore these observed differences in greater detail, the researchers decided to compare students in the study with professionals, and males with females in each of these subgroups. The results of these comparisons, which do shed some light on the observed differences, follow.

2. Social Responsibility Among Students Versus Professionals.

The results of the t-tests comparing students with professionals are found in Table 2. Examination of this material reveals some difference between students and professionals.

The mean social responsibility score of professionals in this study was 35.3, indicating a moderately high level of social responsibility. The overall student score was lower (34.6), and differed significantly. The students still scored, on the average, rather high in terms of general social responsibility.

Examination of the differences between students and professionals item-by-item reveals the basis for the overall difference. Although the mean scores for students were very close to professionals throughout, one significant difference does stand out. The mean for professionals on the willingness to volunteer item differed significantly from the students' mean on this item. The professionals indicated a greater

TABLE 1
MALE-FEMALE COMPARISONS FOR
ENTIRE SAMPLE

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>t-VALUE</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>PROBABILITY</u>
Overall	Women	216	35.18	2.74	223.88	.007*
	Men	102	34.07			
Current Events	Women	217	4.37	-.30	216.39	.766
	Men	104	4.39			
Time For Country	Women	217	4.22	.42	179.53	.673
	Men	104	4.18			
Elections	Women	216	4.47	-.72	234.48	.472
	Men	104	4.52			
Letting Friends Down	Women	217	4.43	1.59	179.50	.114
	Men	102	4.25			
Do One's Best	Women	217	4.69	1.75	141.81	.083*
	Men	104	4.52			
Distance From Others	Women	217	4.75	2.78	138.45	.006*
	Men	103	4.50			
Volunteer	Women	217	3.78	4.19	159.65	.000*
	Men	103	3.33			
Keep Promises	Women	217	4.65	1.68	193.79	.095*
	Men	104	4.53			

*=Significant at P .10

willingness, on the average, than did students to volunteer for special projects. The mean scores of both students and professionals were above 4 (possible low=1, possible high=5) on every item except the volunteerism one, indicating a rather high sense of responsibility across items. It is interesting that the item on which the average professional and the average student scored lowest would also be the item upon which these two groups differ the most. The politics of self interest, perhaps, have established themselves even more firmly among younger people than among working professionals.

3. Social Responsibility Among Men Verses Women: Student Results.

The results of the comparison of male with female students appears in Table 3. On the combined score, female students averaged significantly higher on overall average social responsibility, with a mean of 35, indicating a moderately high level of responsibility. The male students average score on overall social responsibility was 33.4, still in the responsible direction, although lower than the women.

In the analysis of individual items for men and women, women consistently displayed a higher mean level of social responsibility than did men, with men scoring higher, but not significantly so only on the elections item. Means for both men and women were above 4 on all of these items. No significant differences were observed on the current events, time to country, number of elections and bad feelings about not getting work done items. Differences were observed, however, on the other four items. For the issue of doing one's best, the mean response for women was 4.68 (with a maximum of 5) while the mean for men was 4.48. Even greater difference

TABLE 2

t-TEST RESULTS FOR COMPARISONS
OF STUDENTS WITH PROFESSIONALS

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>t-VALUE</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>PROBABILITY</u>
Overall	Students	215	34.60	-1.86	279.16	.064*
	Professionals	104	35.30			
Current Events	Students	216	4.35	-1.09	235.28	.276
	Professionals	105	4.44			
Time for Country	Students	216	4.20	-0.31	168.01	.754
	Professionals	105	4.23			
Elections	Students	215	4.46	-1.11	207.00	.267
	Professionals	105	4.55			
Letting Friends Down	Students	215	4.35	-0.59	218.84	.557
	Professionals	104	4.41			
Do One's Best	Students	216	4.63	-0.36	173.06	.723
	Professionals	105	4.66			
Distance From Others	Students	216	4.65	-0.86	245.30	.388
	Professionals	104	4.71			
Volunteer	Students	216	3.56	-2.54	225.73	.012*
	Professionals	104	3.80			
Keep Promises	Students	216	4.61	-0.12	272.49	.904
	Professionals	105	4.62			

*Significant at P .10

-16-

was observed on the issue of the appropriateness of letting one's friends down. Women exhibited a mean score of 4.4, while the mean for men was 4.1. Although both men and women in this case registered agreement that it is bad to let ones friends down, the responses of women surveyed supported this view in significantly greater strength. A large difference was observed between sexes on the item dealing with association with others (men=4.34, women=4.77). In this case, again, women exhibited the more responsible position, disagreeing that people would be a lot better off if they could live far from others. Again, however, the position of males reflected a responsible attitude, but less so than among women. The largest difference was obtained on the volunteerism item. Women indicated a significantly greater willingness to volunteer (mean=3.7) than did men (3.1). It should be noted that the mean score of men on this item reflects a minimum balance in favor of responsibility. A score of 3 would indicate a complete split between responsible and irresponsible inclinations, and anything less than a 3 would indicate a greater degree of irresponsibility. This was also the lowest score found for both sexes across all items. It would seem that the decline of the spirit of volunteerism found in this study seems to provide a basis for differences between the sexes, as well as between students and professionals.

The differences found for students are not all the same as those found for the combined groups analysis. Male and female students differed significantly on the appropriateness of letting one's friends down, yet no such difference was observed in the examination of the means for male and female professionals (4.46 and 4.38, respectively). The relatively high mean for male professionals (although not statistically significant)

makes up for the low score attained by male students when these groups are combined.

It may be concluded, then, that the overall differences observed in the combined groups analysis are attributable largely to the differences found between male and female students.

The other inconsistent difference is on the item about the doing jobs one has promised to do. A significant difference was observed between men and women in the combined groups analysis, but this difference disappeared in secondary analysis. Again, the spread of scores among male and female respondents when divided into student and professional groups accounts for this difference. However, in this case, no single group accounts for the difference. It is spread among shifts in males and females of both groups.

It may be concluded, then, that the overall difference observed in the combined groups, and three of the specific item differences found there, are attributable largely to the student attitudes, and the differences found between male and female students. The fourth item difference seems to be a statistical artifact, as described above.

4. Social Responsibility Among Men Versus Women: Results for Professionals.

The findings of this research for professionals did not reflect differences similar to those found among students. As depicted in Table 4, no significant difference was observed between male and female professionals on the combined social responsibility score. Both men and women displayed a moderately high level of responsibility.

Examining the t-test results across the individual items of the SRS scale, no significant differences were observed. In looking over the scores for men and women, the volunteerism issue again accrued the lowest support from both women and men. It is interesting to note that, although

TABLE 3

t-TEST RESULTS FOR COMPARISON
OF MALE WITH FEMALE STUDENTS

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>t-VALUE</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>PROBABILITY</u>
Overall	Women	153	35.05	3.05	136.9	.003*
	Men	62	33.45			
Current Events	Women	154	4.35	0.11	133.14	.912
	Men	62	4.33			
Time for Country	Women	154	4.24	1.43	110.74	.155
	Men	62	4.09			
Elections	Women	153	4.43	-1.08	147.21	.282
	Men	62	4.53			
Letting Friends Down	Women	154	4.44	2.35	99.20	.021*
	Men	61	4.11			
Do One's Best	Women	154	4.68	1.73	85.31	.087*
	Men	62	4.48			
Distance From Others	Women	154	4.77	3.21	71.35	.002*
	Men	62	4.34			
Volunteer	Women	154	3.75	4.51	90.62	.000*
	Men	62	3.11			
Keep Promises	Women	154	4.66	1.48	103.41	.142
	Men	62	4.50			

*=Significant at P .10

TABLE 4

t-TEST RESULTS FOR COMPARISON
OF MALE WITH FEMALE PROFESSIONALS

<u>VARIABLE</u>	<u>GROUP</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>t-VALUE</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>PROBABILITY</u>
Overall	Women	63	35.49	0.87	75.10	.387
	Men	41	35.00			
Current Events	Women	63	4.41	-0.46	76.44	.646
	Men	42	4.48			
Time for Country	Women	63	4.17	-0.77	75.51	.446
	Men	42	4.31			
Elections	Women	63	4.57	0.34	86.46	.733
	Men	42	4.52			
Letting Friends Down	Women	63	4.38	-0.49	81.41	.629
	Men	41	4.46			
Do One's Best	Women	63	4.71	0.80	57.41	.429
	Men	42	4.57			
Distance From Others	Women	63	4.70	-0.31	101.35	.756
	Men	41	4.73			
Volunteer	Women	63	3.89	1.44	73.36	.154
	Men	41	3.66			
Keep Promises	Women	63	4.64	0.81	85.47	.421
	Men	42	4.57			

the differences are not significant, men registered higher mean scores than women on four of the eight items. These were current events, elections, time to one's country, and letting friends down.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The overall pattern represented in these findings suggests that the students seem to possess a more fragmented attitude about social responsibility than do professionals. Several significant differences exist between men and women students where no such differences appear among professionals. The one major difference between students and professionals on the issue of volunteerism, and the overall difference between the two groups requires explanation.

Women students tended to endorse more strongly the traditional values of doing one's best, keeping promises to friends, the need to associate oneself with others, and the worth of volunteering. The male students seem to have acquired these aspects of personality, but to a significantly lesser degree. This does seem to make sense given the traditional male upbringing in America, with an emphasis on doing enough to get by, looking out for number one, keeping to oneself, and never, never volunteering. The males in this study exhibit higher scores on political attitudes, such as elections, current events, and serving one's country. A traditional frame of reference would have expected these differences to be greater than were found in this study. But certainly these values, or similar ones were taught to the professionals in this study when they were young. It may be that through experience in the communications professions, a more socially responsible personality develops.

One possible explanation for the relative uniformity of attitude among male and female professionals may be that experience working in the public relations field serves to shape the attitude toward one of greater responsibility, and that such experience may accomplish this more so for men than for women. If this is the case, one would expect the students to increase in level of social responsibility over time. The men, in particular, should be expected to learn more responsibility over time.

On the other hand, if the view is taken that these attitudes are deeply ingrained, one may look to these results as an indicator of decline in the future responsibility of communications professionals. In this view, those who are now students will carry their existing attitudes about social responsibility with them into the field, to the detriment of the profession.

The importance of sound education in more than the skills aspects of the communication profession is indicated in this research. Communication educators must provide a sound base of socially responsible attitudes upon which subsequent experience can develop in an ethically meaningful way. Educators must especially examine their curricula for ways to develop a greater sense of volunteerism among students, and strive to combat the malaise of self interest that, in this research, serves as the principle difference between students and their professional counterparts.

FOOTNOTES

¹For a more complete description of the role of women in public relations, see Scott M. Cutlip, Allen H. Center and Glen M. Broom, Effective Public Relations, 6th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1985), pp. 60 and 70-72. Also see Rea W. Smith, "Women in Public Relations," Public Relations Journal (October 1968), pp. 26-27 and 29; and Sondra K. Gorney, "Status of Women in Public Relations," Public Relations Journal (May 1975), pp. 10-13.

²Personal correspondence with Jaci Locker, Membership Director, Public Relations Society of America, New York, February 5, 1985.

³The IABC membership statistics are taken from Profile/85: IABC Special Report (San Francisco: International Association of Business Communicators, 1985).

⁴Paul V. Peterson, "Survey Indicates No Change In Journalism Enrollment," Journalism Educator (Spring 1984), pp. 3-12.

⁵Glen M. Broom and George D. Smith, "Testing the Practitioners Impact on Clients," Public Relations Review (Fall 1979), pp. 63-70.

⁶David M. Dozier, Sharon Chapo and Brad Sullivan, "Sex and the Bottom Line: Income Differences Among Women and Men in Public Relations," paper presented to the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Annual Convention, Corvallis, Oregon, August 1983.

⁷Don Bates, "A Concern: Will Women Inherit the Profession?" Public Relations Journal (July 1983), p. 6.

⁸Donald K. Wright, "Professionalism and Social Responsibility in Public Relations," Public Relations Review (Fall 1979), pp. 48-61.

⁹Harrison G. Gough, Herbert McClosky and Paul E. Meehl, "A Personality Scale for Social Responsibility," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (vol. 47, 1952), pp. 73-80.

¹⁰Dale B. Harris, "A Scale for Measuring Attitudes of Social Responsibility in Children," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, (Vol. 55, 1968), pp. 322-326.

¹¹Leonard Berkowitz and Kenneth G. Lutterman, "The Traditionally Socially Responsible Personality," Public Opinion Quarterly, (Vol. 32, 1968), pp. 169-185.

¹²Gough, McClosky and Meehl, op. cit.

¹³ Leonard Berkowitz and Louise R. Daniels, "Affecting the Salience of the Social Responsibility Norm," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, (Vol. 68, 1964), pp. 275-281. Also see, Harris, op. cit., and Berkowitz and Lutterman, op. cit.

¹⁴ Harris, op. cit., Berkowitz and Lutterman, op. cit., Berkowitz and Daniels, op. cit., Gough, McClosky and Meehl, op. cit.

¹⁵ Donald K. Wright, "Social Responsibility in Public Relations: A Multistep Theory," Public Relations Review, (Fall, 1976), pp. 24-36.

¹⁶ Rex W. Harlow, "Public Relations Definitions Through The Years," Public Relations Review, (Spring, 1977), pp. 32-61.

¹⁷ Richard W. Darrow, "American Attitudes Toward Big Business," in Hill and Knowlton Executives, eds., Critical Issues in Public Relations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975), pp. 1-11.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ For a more complete review see Raymond Simon, Public Relations Concepts and Practice (Columbus, Ohio: Grid, 1976), pp. 58-61.

²⁰ Milton Friedman, "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase Its Profits," in "The Sunday Times Magazine," New York Times, (September 13, 1970), pp. 32-33.

²¹ Milton Friedman, "Social Responsibility and Corporate Policy Making," in Edward J. Blander, ed., The Corporation in a Democratic Society (New York: Wilson, 1975), pp. 43-45.

²² Committee for Economic Development, The Changing Social Contract With Business, (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1971), Chapter 1, "Social Responsibility of Business Corporations."

²³ David Finn, "Modifying Opinions in the New Human Climate," Public Relations Quarterly, (Fall, 1972), pp. 12-15 and 26-27.

²⁴ Frank W. Wylie remarks to the Southeast Public Relations Institute, Athens, Georgia, October 14, 1977.

²⁵ Leonard Krasner and Leonard P. Ullmann, Behavior Influence and Personality: The Social Matrix of Human Action (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), pp. 22-23.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 489.

²⁷ B. F. Skinner, "Operant Behavior," American Psychologist, (Vol. 18, 1963), pp. 503-515. See also, J.B. Watson, "Psychology as a Behaviorist Views It," Psychological Review, (Vol. 20, 1913), pp. 158-177.

- ²⁸Berkowitz and Daniels, op. cit.
- ²⁹Berkowitz and Lutterman, op. cit.
- ³⁰Herbert McClosky and John H. Schaar, "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy," American Sociological Review, (Vol. 30, 1965), pp. 14-40.
- ³¹Gough, McClosky and Meehl, op. cit.
- ³²Marvin E. Olsen, "Alienation and Political Opinions," Public Opinion Quarterly, (Vol. 29, 1965), pp. 200-212.
- ³³Berkowitz and Lutterman, op. cit.
- ³⁴Ibid.
- ³⁵Ibid.
- ³⁶Ibid.
- ³⁷Ibid.
- ³⁸Peterson, op. cit.